

August 4, 1966

learn to do, to explore, to discover, to create. Thus, they will be more ready for regular school learning—for a brighter and more fulfilling future."

A throng of 3500 Orleans children are about to enter this new world on June 20. The Orleans Parish School Board in cooperation with Total Community Action will begin its third Project Head Start.

There will be 175 classes in 48 schools for eight weeks—two four week periods.

"We need 800 volunteers in this new world. Each is asked to serve two or three consecutive days, hopefully, for the entire eight weeks, but at least for one of the four-week periods," says Mrs. Floyd.

"We're looking for college students, graduating high school seniors, club women—people who love to work with children."

The first four-week period will run from June 20 to July 15. The second will be from July 18 to August 21.

Volunteers who would like to be a part of Head Start are being interviewed now at Project Pre-Kindergarten headquarters in the old post office building at 600 Camp, Room 100. There will be an orientation program on June 21 from 9 a.m. to noon at the Edward Hynes School, 990 Harrison, for Head Start volunteers.

Heading the Head Start staff is Dr. Malcolm F. Rosenberg, assistant superintendent in charge of instruction. Mrs. A. J. Waechter Jr., is chairman of the advisory volunteer committee.

ROLE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN DEFEAT OF POVERTY

(Mr. MOELLER (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, off and on again over the past 2 years in this Chamber and in the various news media across the country, there has been periodic dialog about the role of private enterprise in the bold experiment which is this affluent Nation's attempt to defeat poverty.

To borrow a phrase from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, "We all know in our hearts that this Nation's antipoverty program is right." And this is so whether you are Republican or Democrat. Yes, this great endeavor is right and the team that has been assembled under the leadership of the director of the OEO, Sergeant Shriver, is by and large, a group of dedicated individuals attempting to fight the problems to which some of our citizens are subjected.

We may sometimes, in our zeal to win this struggle, tend to forget that it is our magnificent private enterprise system which has produced the affluence which affords our Nation the great opportunity to fight poverty.

This continuing indirect role of our private enterprise system is brought to mind on those occasions when one of our Nation's great companies takes its time and resources to involve itself. Such a situation developed just last week in my district.

While attending the Jackson County Fair at Wellston, Ohio, I took the opportunity to visit several schools in the area to see, at first hand, how our Headstart programs were going.

The teachers and the little children involved in Headstart are truly exciting. One can almost see the cloud of a dim future being lifted from the eyes of the children involved. The glum expressions of children with futures dimmed by lack of opportunity is being literally replaced by the bright and eager eyes of youngsters who have a future and will make a contribution.

One aspect of my visit, however, was disturbing. I happened to ask one little boy if he had brushed his teeth that morning. He shook his head, and with a shy smile, and a shrug of the shoulders indicated that he did not know what I was talking about. It later developed that a great number of the children in the Headstart programs, within the 10th Congressional District, had never visited a dentist and did not know what toothpaste and toothbrushes were. Faced with this situation I went to the phone and placed two long-distance calls. One to the Lever Bros. Co., in New York and the other to the Procter & Gamble Co., in Cincinnati. I frankly explained the situation to the executives, contacted on the phone, and was totally gratified with the reactions I received.

Mr. Speaker, within the hour, I received a confirmation from Mr. Warren Gerz of the Lever Bros. Co., that 80 dozen large-size tubes of Pepsodent toothpaste and 80 dozen junior-size Pepsodent toothbrushes were on their way to the Headstart programs in Jackson County. Subsequently, I received word from Mr. C. C. Uhling of Procter & Gamble that this fine organization was dispatching 200 toothbrushes to my district office for ultimate distribution within the 10th Congressional District.

It goes without saying that I take this occasion to commend, in the highest terms, the individuals and the two great companies, Procter & Gamble and Lever Bros., for their splendid response. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of all my colleagues, the great good will and spirit of cooperation which exists in our profitmaking system. It is there, gentlemen, and believe me, from this experience, it stands ready to aid Government at all levels in the noble efforts to combat ~~disadvantage~~.

NORTH VIETNAMESE PRISONERS

(Mr. STRATTON (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the Watertown, N.Y., Daily Times wonders whether the captured North Vietnamese seamen will give us a bargaining lever with Hanoi.

The United States possesses strong military and political levers, the newspaper says in an editorial. It remarks, however, on the unpredictability of the Communists.

At any rate, the Watertown newspaper points out, the captured seamen prove that North Vietnam is actively engaged in combat with the United States. It adds that they might be used

in exchange for American servicemen held in North Vietnam. And it further adds that our holding of these men might persuade North Vietnam to comply with the Geneva Convention on treatment of war prisoners.

This is certainly a hope to be kept alive, and I offer the editorial stating that hope for the RECORD:

PRISONERS, A BARGAINING LEVER?

Announcement that the United States is holding 19 North Vietnamese seamen as prisoners of war has a number of important meanings—and possibilities. These hostages serve both military and political purposes.

First, the positive identification of these sailors as being from North Viet Nam establishes a fact we had known all along, but which had not been definitely proved to some doubting nations: North Viet Nam, contrary to its protestations, is actively engaged in combat against the United States.

Second, there is speculation these 19 sailors might be used in an exchange for some of the 63 American servicemen held by Communist forces in Viet Nam.

Third, the fact the United States has these hostages might possibly persuade North Viet Nam to comply with the 1949 Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war.

Holding of these 19 North Vietnamese is a departure from the U.S. policy of turning prisoners over to South Vietnamese authorities. But it is done with good reason.

In the past, North Viet Nam, in denying it was actively engaged in the war, always accepted men sent back to Hanoi by the South Vietnamese not as repatriated prisoners, but as refugees from the South. But now the U.S. and South Viet Nam have a lever of proof.

In contrast to the North Vietnamese soldiers, who normally are captured without any identifying insignia or uniform of the North Vietnamese army, the 19 sailors were captured in uniform and taken from two motor torpedo boats that clearly came from North Viet Nam and made an unsuccessful attack on a U.S. naval vessel June 30 in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Hanoi has announced it considers captured American airmen as war criminals; may try them as such; and would not hesitate to execute them—unless the U.S. succumbs to such blackmail by pulling out of Viet Nam.

So now the questions arise: Will Hanoi concede its troops are in combat against the United States? Will North Viet Nam, which like the U.S. was a signatory to the Geneva treaty, decide to abide by it? And will it cooperate in a prisoner-of-war exchange? The United States possesses strong military and political levers. But Communists are unpredictable.

REIMBURSEMENT OF MEDICARE PATIENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for the reimbursement of medicare patients for their transportation to a hospital or rehabilitation center to receive the care of a physical therapist.

The bill quite simply, would strike out language in the Medicare Act (title XVIII, sec. 1861, m, 7), which states that expenses can be paid "but not including

17470

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 4, 1966

transportation of the individual in connection with any such item or service."

This bill was initially introduced by my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] and deserves the careful attention of all Members.

The present wording of the statute made it necessary for therapists to travel to patients' homes or to distant extended care facilities. The effect of this is to dissipate the time of the qualified practitioners, and hence to reduce their availability for these crucial services. Our principal purpose in medicare, of course, was to maximize the efficiency of medical aid for the elderly.

As presently written, the travel provisions are reducing that efficiency and limiting the amount of available service for our needy. The short supply of our therapists requires that we preserve their energies and utilize their skill most effectively. We can do this by giving patients the resources to travel to care centers and hospitals. I would hope that the Congress might act favorably on the legislation introduced by my colleague from Minnesota, and cosponsored today, by me.

REFLECTION ON COAST GUARD'S DEDICATED SERVICE

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today we honor an organization which has a long and distinguished record of service to our Nation and to humanity.

In celebrating the 176th birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard, I think we should reflect just a moment on the outstanding service which this small, but dedicated branch of Government has established. Since its inception in 1790, the Coast Guard has fought Napoleon's navy, cleared the Gulf of Mexico of pirates, and now is helping to defend freedom in Vietnam.

We in Florida are particularly aware of the gigantic task the Coast Guard does. Since it established a patrol in the Florida Straits in 1958 the Coast Guard has rescued or assisted more than 12,500 Cuban refugees from small boats and islands between Florida and Cuba. During the Cuban exodus in October and November 1965, more than 4,000 refugees were assisted.

For the tiny fleet which Alexander Hamilton envisioned, the Coast Guard has grown into a worldwide service with operations extending around the globe. While being on constant military readiness, its duties include ocean research, maintaining an extensive program of maritime safety and promoter and keeper of national security. That is quite a bit of work for a service with approximately 33,000 officers and men.

We owe a great debt to the Coast Guard. For its effort now and for the American heritage which it helped build.

CONTROL OF MOSQUITOES

(Mr. PATTEN (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted per-

mission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which would provide for the control of mosquitoes through research and technical assistance.

This is not a new subject to come before the House; however, it is a subject which certainly merits more attention than it has received in the past.

Legislation has come before this body many times in recent Congresses which would deal with the dangers of disease outbreak from mosquitoes and mosquito vectors. There has been, in fact, no bill enacted; it has been nearly a decade since hearings were held on the subject.

My bill is similar to that which was introduced by the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] a year ago January. I am hopeful that the response of the House will be more favorable now.

We in Middlesex County, N.J., have feared being plagued by the presence of a large number of mosquitoes in the Raritan Arsenal area. Leaders in county government, in industry, in civic affairs, and in the health professions have warned repeatedly that such a situation could be a breeding ground for an encephalitis epidemic.

The president of a local trucking firm has written to tell me that his 12 workmen on the night shift "are kept so busy fighting off the hungry monsters that we are finding it difficult to keep abreast of our work." "I've never seen any mosquitoes as large or as vicious as those that breed here," his day dispatcher also reported.

These mosquitoes are worse than a nuisance—they are clearly a health hazard. We know all too well the histories of past epidemics which have resulted from unchecked mosquito expansion.

I have written to Surgeon General Dr. William Stewart in reference to this problem and have received a reply from Dr. David J. Sencer, Assistant Surgeon General and Chief, Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta.

Dr. Sencer reported:

The Public Health Service does not have funds available for direct aid to States, counties or communities for the control of pestiferous mosquitoes, except in emergencies such as floods or epidemics of vector-transmitted diseases.

In other words, until the tragedy strikes, our hands are tied. It certainly would appear that the old cliché an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure would be directly applicable here. We are faced with a menace which we do not have the proper means to combat. Our local mosquito control commission has spent over \$60,000 in 6 months in an effort to lessen the danger of an outbreak but this has not proven to be sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I also know from past experience that our case is not isolated. Other Congressmen have attempted to battle mosquitoes in past Congresses and they have met with little success. My distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]

have worked incessantly for a mosquito control project such as the one I am introducing today. They could recite to you chapter and verse the difficulties which they have had and with which they have suffered as a result of the lack of effective mosquito control.

Under this bill, Congress would establish a program of aiding technical study and research for mosquito control, of providing Federal facilities for the execution of State and local programs and of making matching grants to assist States and localities.

Hopefully, this act will alleviate the present injurious effect on agricultural activities, urban use activities, the development of recreational facilities and community development in general occasioned by the existence of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease.

We have already waited too long to mobilize our forces against this common enemy. We must turn over attention to the mosquito problem and we must organize for its control.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a publication of the American Mosquito Control Association entitled "Why Organize for Mosquito Control." I believe that it succinctly summarizes the problems involved with the various species of mosquitoes and the different diseases which they carry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for immediate and positive consideration of my bill.

The article follows:

WHY ORGANIZE FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL

In the United States, almost 150 species of mosquitoes are recognized. Many of these have certain requirements of temperature, altitude, type of water, and other basic factors in their environments which tend to limit their occurrence. We call some species "house" mosquitoes, "field" mosquitoes, "snow" mosquitoes, "salt marsh" mosquitoes, and other names which identify their normal production areas. Although these names generally apply, we often find them "away from home" or outside their usual habitat. Many kinds of mosquitoes are so well fitted for survival that they can live under very adverse conditions. While only about 150 different species of mosquitoes may live in an area the size of the United States, they may be found in many thousand types of habitats. Consequently, mosquitoes occur nearly everywhere.

They maintain a continuous attack upon us with little warning. They pump blood from our cattle and horses under our very eyes. They are well equipped to occupy this earth, since they have been on earth some 50 million years; the human race is but 500,000 years old.

In the mosquitoes' developing life, water is required. Before the eggs can hatch into active wrigglers and before these can develop into a less active pupal stage, water or sufficient moisture is an absolute necessity. However, when they are fully grown they are two-winged vigorous insects which may be capable of flights to areas many miles from the water. The mosquitoes which are most annoying may be growing in the vase on the living room table or in the fish pond in our yard. On the other hand, they might very well come to us from distant rivers, lakes, ponds, swamps, or other natural waters. Floods, rains, melting snow or high tides create places for young mosquitoes to grow. We build reservoirs, dams, ditches, sewage ponds and numerous other water areas which provide additional larval habitats. We irrigate our lawns, golf courses, fields, crops, and pastures and produce varieties of water

August 4, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17471

resources for enterprising mosquitoes. It seems that man and nature together multiply the number of mosquito sources.

In recent years, the importance of malaria has been reduced in many parts of the world by mosquito control or eradication. Yellow fever and dengue, both important mosquito-borne diseases, are rare now because we have learned how to reduce the mosquito populations where these diseases were once common. In some areas *Aedes aegypti*, the vector of urban yellow fever, has been eradicated. Suppression of encephalitis, also a mosquito transmitted disease, is being approached through mosquito control. Many communities now exist where mosquitoes once claimed the land. Crops are being produced in swampy localities which we once feared to enter because of the vast mosquito menace. We work, vacation, and live in many places because mosquito control has made it possible to do so. We hear the names of a few great men associated with these outstanding mosquito control projects; but we know that those capable persons did not accomplish these programs alone. They were the leaders, scientists, and more important, the believers in the possibility of effective mosquito control through organization. No individual could have controlled the mosquito problem which spread in Brazil following the introduction of a malaria mosquito from Africa. Many hundreds of men, trained and organized, required several years to accomplish this result. In our local communities, we must plan mosquito control through organization. A united defense against mosquitoes on a continuing basis is our only hope for success.

VIETNAM

(Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to a remarkable statement about the conflict in Vietnam which was made recently by Michael Monroney, the vigorous young candidate for Congress, who is seeking the Democratic nomination in the Eighth District of Maryland.

The statement is remarkable because it shows clear evidence of calm and courageous thinking on a subject that has been clouded over in many campaigns by hysteria and demagoguery. I consider it one of the most thoughtful endorsements of the principles behind our involvement in Vietnam that I have ever come across.

Unfortunately, this statement did not receive as widespread attention from the press as it deserved. I feel it should be read carefully by every intelligent American citizen:

LET'S TALK SENSE ABOUT VIET-NAM
(Text of speech by Michael Monroney
Saturday, July 30, 1966)

The issue of America's military involvement in Viet-Nam has implications far beyond the security from oppression of one small Southeast Asian nation.

Upon the results of this conflict rests the future security and peace of all men and women who desire freedom and the right to direct their own destiny.

Upon the results of this conflict could well rest the fate of our liberty here at home in years ahead.

Every aspect of our present policy—and, most importantly, the acceptable alternatives—must be weighed in any debate of this vital problem as an issue in this Congressional race.

I find it bitterly ironic and distasteful that two of my opponents—in an apparent attempt to make political capital from this desperate struggle—have either naively or dishonestly ignored so many of the facts which have generated our increased involvement in this conflict.

I find it disheartening that they have failed to provide one single acceptable alternative.

Every American abhors the thought of people killing other people. Every American shares the grief of families who have lost sons in this far-off, war-weary land. Every American shudders at the thought of escalation into nuclear holocaust.

Any American policy—short of withdrawing every American soldier from Viet-Nam or blatantly ignoring any avenue to a peaceful settlement—involves this abhorrence, this grief, this fear.

My two opponents do not have a monopoly on these emotions, but these very emotions, so it appears, have motivated their statements on Viet-Nam. They would indeed be less naive—or, at least, more intellectually honest—to have the courage to call for immediate withdrawal of every American soldier from Viet-Nam.

This course of action—however inconsistent with the realities of what is happening in Viet-Nam—would at least be consistent with their abhorrence, their grief and their fears.

Instead—without reviewing the facts, without examining the record—they have implied that this Administration has failed to pursue every possible means of negotiating a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam.

Instead—without regard for the consequences—they have suggested alternatives which would only prolong the agony of Viet-Nam and which would only intensify the efforts of our enemies.

For the sake of honest political debate and in the interest of intelligent public dialogue, let us talk sense about Viet-Nam. Let us review the record.

The gallant efforts of the United Nations brought to an abrupt halt an outright Communist attempt at armed aggression in Korea. As a result, Peking came up with a different strategy to spread the Communist sphere of influence.

We are facing this strategy in Viet-Nam today. It is a cleverly designed effort to conceal the spread of Communist control over nations by representing, in this instance, the Viet Cong and the National Liberation Front as a strong indigenous movement, more nationalist than Communist and with the genuine support of the people of South Viet-Nam.

We must not be duped into accepting this idea.

This so-called "war of national liberation" was and is nothing more than a shabbily disguised experiment—now openly admitted as such in Peking to test the Free World's alertness and determination to preventing the spread of Communism.

There is ample evidence that the Viet Cong—who kidnapped, maimed or murdered once every fifteen minutes during our 37-day peace offensive earlier this year—are nothing more than grisly gangsters working the wicked will of Hanoi and Peking.

And now we face North Vietnamese regulars, invaders, filtered into South Viet-Nam in increasing numbers as a desperate attempt to save the Communist experiment from failure.

Fortunately or unfortunately, the determination of the Free World to break the back of this evil experiment is dependent upon the patience and courage of the American people and the fortitude of our fighting men in Southeast Asia.

The President has said, "We did not ask to be the guardian of the gate, but there is no one else."

In fact, there are others. Korean, Australian and New Zealand troops are fighting in South Viet-Nam. The Philippine government, for example, will soon dispatch to South Viet-Nam 2,000 military engineers with sufficient troops to protect them. Every member-nation of SEATO is providing some form of military or non-military aid to support South Viet-Nam.

These nations—and others—recognize the dangers to them if this deadly experiment is successful. The Prime Minister of the new State of Singapore supports us, saying our presence in Viet-Nam is "buying time" for a stable Communist-resistant Southeast Asia.

Don't fall victim to cries that we have no friends who support us in South Viet-Nam. We do!

One of my opponents has called for a halt to the bombings, a halt to the build-up of American forces in South Viet-Nam. He says we should seek a *de facto* cease-fire, ordering American troops not to fire unless fired upon.

We cannot have a unilateral peace, my friend. Your suggestion—however well-intended—will serve only to intensify the "fight-fight-fight" policy as stated by Ho Chi Minh.

It would only, I fear, be interpreted as a sign of appeasement by Hanoi and Peking. It would only, I fear, lose whatever initiative we may have gained since the last peace offensive six months ago.

It would only, I fear, increase our casualties. A dead man can't shoot back!

This particular candidate has provided other "answers" to the problems, one of them being that we request a reconvening of the Geneva Conference. Secretary Rusk has made it clear he would agree to just such a proposal, including one made recently by the Prime Minister of India.

It would contribute to intelligent debate if this particular candidate would read the newspapers!

It would contribute to intelligent debate if this particular candidate would not represent as his own thinking proposals which he has plagiarized from offers already made by our State Department... assuming, of course, that his unilateral peace might work!

It would contribute to intelligent debate if we could get something more than armchair diplomacy from this particular candidate!

I have another opponent who has offered as his solution a halt to the escalation and redoubled efforts to obtain peace talks.

He says his position is—and I quote—"somewhere between the President and Senator FULBRIGHT." I submit to you that this particular candidate is afraid to agree with the President and afraid to disagree with him.

True to form, this particular candidate has his feet planted firmly on both sides of the fence.

His halt to the escalation would, I assume, entail a halt to the bombings of North Viet-Nam and a halt to the build-up of American troops in South Viet-Nam.

Such action would have the same effect as I have already described with regard to a similar position taken by his fellow expert.

As a result, let us take a look at his proposal for redoubling our efforts for a negotiated settlement.

Quite honestly, I do not know what this Administration can do—short of the President crawling down the streets of Hanoi on his hands and knees—to convince Hanoi and Peking and Moscow that the United States Government wants to sit down around a table and discuss a way to end this war.

It is my understanding that we have—in addition to repeated and direct appeals from our own diplomatic sources—utilized the diplomatic channels of more than 70 other nations to convey to Hanoi and Peking and Moscow our desire for peace talks.

17472

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 4, 1966

Other nations have undertaken unilateral diplomatic action repeatedly to bring this conflict to a halt.

Every attempt to bring about peace talks, even preliminary discussions, has been turned down flatly, and I would suggest to my two opponents that for each such attempt which has received news coverage it is just possible that others have not.

Furthermore, I have read the "14 points" which our government has established as the element for an honorable peace. These "14 points" provide a reasonable basis for bringing a halt to the fighting.

Take a look at the 13th point.

"The President has said, 'The Viet Cong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an unsurmountable problem.'"

And let us take a look at Hanoi's reply. They insist that the Viet Cong be accepted as the sole bargaining representative for the people of South Viet-Nam at any negotiations.

Their terms, in effect, state that we must turn over South Viet-Nam to the agents of Hanoi's war of national liberation before we even sit down to discuss the fate of the people of South Viet-Nam.

Let us take a look at our 14th point.

"We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Viet-Nam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped."

On this point, I could only suggest the following re-wording:

"We will halt all aerial and ground attacks if the other side will reciprocate in order to begin preliminary discussions for a peaceful settlement."

This is at best a practical and concrete suggestion based on the record, rather than a grandstand play for political gain.

As another possibility for dramatizing our desire for peace, I might suggest that the United States unilaterally call for a conclave of representatives from the more than 40 nations with which we have formal mutual security agreements.

Such a meeting would be designed to launch a coordinated effort through the diplomatic channels of each of these nations for a negotiated settlement to the war in Viet-Nam.

Such a meeting would—if practicable—add one more effort for peace to those which have already been made, including the tireless attempts by U Thant through the available machinery of the United Nations.

Our President has said he would go anywhere, any place, at any time to discuss peace.

On this basis and as another constructive proposal, I would suggest that the President make himself available with his chief foreign adviser in Tokyo in September. The suggestion would include an invitation to the heads of state and their foreign ministers of not only those nations with which we have mutual security agreements, but also comparable representatives from Hanoi, Peking, Moscow and the Communist bloc nations.

A meeting of this kind—with no preconditions other than a mutual desire for peace—would at least bring the participants together for discussion.

I cannot hold out personal hope that such additional efforts would succeed, but it would provide additional evidence for all the world to witness of our nation's intense desire to end this increasingly dangerous conflict. Such efforts would be consistent with the hope and faith which has made our nation great.

I am not, however, personally convinced that Hanoi, Peking or even Moscow want peace in Southeast Asia short of Communist

control of that entire segment of the world.

Every attempt we have made—every attempt made by hundreds of diplomatic missions and messages by more than 70 other nations—has been met by a brick wall.

There are several things you can do with a brick wall. You can ignore it. You can penetrate it. You can flatten it. But you cannot negotiate with it. We do not want to ignore, penetrate or flatten this brick wall, but we do want to negotiate with it.

All avenues to peace failing while all avenues to peace are being tried, I take the position that the United States must continue its military efforts in Viet-Nam. We must continue until one of the avenues to peace is opened.

I take the position that—until one of these avenues is opened—our air strikes against military targets in North Viet-Nam are justified. I would, however, not condone the bombing of any non-military targets.

As for the elections in South Viet-Nam on September 11, I would adopt a wait-and-see attitude. I do not feel it is appropriate to condone or condemn in advance this attempt on the part of the people of South Viet-Nam to establish a constituent assembly for the purpose of self-determination.

In summary, I urge the armchair quarterbacks—and I myself qualify in this category—to exercise understanding and tolerance of the risks which our nation is taking in Southeast Asia.

At no time in the history of mankind—because at no time has mankind been armed with such weapons of devastation—has any one people been entrusted with so great a responsibility.

There is no question that we are treading on the brink of grave dangers by our policy in that far-away land.

We are fighting a fight which—several years ago—it might have been possible to keep clear of, if only to delay the time and the place when we must make our stand.

But, my friends, the die is now cast.

Proceeding with great caution, we must see this conflict through. We must insure that this Communist-inspired experiment fails—knowing full well the risks involved—if we are to assure freedom-loving people around the world and our children and their children any guarantees of peace and security and any rights of self-determination.

We owe at least this—and nothing less than this—to the responsibility of world leadership which we have so unwillingly inherited.

We owe at least this—and nothing less than this—to future generations of Americans who must have the peace tomorrow which we must sacrifice today.

Thank you.

HANDICAPPED CHILD BENEFIT AND EDUCATION ACT

(Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Handicapped Child Benefit and Education Act."

As chairman of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Handicapped of the Committee on Education and Labor, it has been my responsibility, with my distinguished colleagues on the subcommittee, to review Government programs currently enacted in this field. In addition, our subcommittee has been made keenly aware of the shortcomings of these programs and the existence of un-

met needs in this area. It has been clearly demonstrated to our Subcommittee that we lack any semblance of a national policy in the education and training of the handicapped. Further, many of the States in turn are without a well-defined public policy to this date.

If this were a passing problem, Federal action might be questioned; however, all signs and indications clearly demonstrate that in the years and decades ahead, we will have an ever increasing number of children who will suffer from deafness, blindness, mental illness and retardation, and multiple handicaps of all kinds. Unless we begin at once to plan and prepare the facilities and personnel required to serve these children, parents will experience a tragic futility in meeting their responsibilities. The handicapped child must not be a burden to the family alone. That burden must be shared by a humanitarian society. Unless something is done without delay, unfortunately we will not have teachers, programs, classrooms and all the special facilities required in this field of special education. It has been lucidly displayed to our Subcommittee that great possibilities for prevention, therapy and improved instruction are possible in special education. All that is lacking is the commitment of adequate resources by the Federal Government to provide the funds necessary to get programs underway.

In the 1,000 days of the administration of our late President John F. Kennedy, we made up our minds to do something about the neglect of the mentally retarded. Due to President Kennedy's leadership and the support of a determined Congress, we have made dynamic advances in the field of mental retardation in the space of a very few months. Hope has displaced despair in the minds and hearts of thousands of parents of retarded children because of our actions. Because we have accomplished this, we must not be content to rest on our record in this field alone; rather, our progress here is a lesson that Federal leadership is required in other types of affliction just as severe as mental retardation.

I do not want to convey the impression that the Federal Government is now exerting a minimal effort in assistance to handicapped persons. Our examination of Federal programs reveals that we are currently expending in excess of \$800 million in a great variety of Federal assistance grant legislation. Such agencies as the Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Bureau of Crippled Children's Services, the Welfare Administration and a score of others are conducting these manifold programs. Even the Library of Congress manages the distribution of publications for the blind. Unfortunately until now, there has been very little coordination and inter-communication among these agencies. This has been brought to the attention of the administration by our subcommittee in the conduct of its hearings. Possessed with this knowledge, I am pleased that President Johnson has already begun to take action to effect better management of these efforts in the executive branch. On